DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 191 SP 006 984

AUTHOR Perlberg, Arye; Theodor, Esther
TITLE Patterns and Styles in the Supervision of Teachers in Individual Conferences Following Classroom Observation.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Audiovisual Aids; *Microteaching; *Supervisory Activities; *Supervisory Training; *Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

This study demonstrates how the use of microteaching techniques allows for the collection of a wealth of comparable data about supervisory behavior in a relatively short time and under well-controlled conditions. This technique, combined with qualitative analysis of the data, investigated the individual's dominant and persuasive patterns of behavior, which determine his general style (without a priori categories), and ensures highly relevant and accurate information, which can provide a useful base for supervisory research. (JB)

ED 083191

PATTERNS AND STYLES IN THE SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS IN INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES FOLLOWING CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Arye Perlberg and Esther Theodor

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Paper presented at the A.E.R.A. - American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting - April 3 - 7, 1972, in Chicago.

Dr. Arye Perlberg is associate professor of education at the Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel, and at the Tel-Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel. Esther Theodor is Supervisor-General in charge of special guidance supervisors in schools for culturally deprived children at the Ministry of Education and Culture, Israel, and Research Associate at the Teacher Training Department of the Technion, I.I.T., Haifa, Israel. She is also Assistant at the Department of Pedagogy at the Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

SP 006 984

March, 1973.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATTERNS AND STYLES IN THE SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS IN INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES FOLLOWING CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

I - INTRODUCTION

II - OBJECTIVES

III - THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

- A. Values and Aims in Supervision.
- B. Teaching Supervision and the Rationale for Centering of Patterns in Supervision.
- C. Problems of Individual Conferences Following Classroom Observation.

IV - METHOD

- A. Subjects.
- B. Procedure.
- C. Analysis.

V - RESULTS

- A. Analysis of the Conferences.
- B. The Teachers' Evaluations.
- C. Some Aspects of the Supervisors' Perceptions of Their Own Supervision.

VI - DISCUSSION

- A. The Advantages of the Unstructured A Postriori Categorization.
- B. Consistency and Change in Supervisory Behavior.
- C. The Set at the Unit of Guidance.
- D. Checking the Patterns Against Values and Aims in Supervison.
- E. Pleasantness and Efficiency.
- F. Styles of Evaluation.
- G. Implications for the Importance of Verbal Behavior.
- H. Some Aspects of the Supervisors' Perceptions of the Supervision.

V - CONCLUSION

Bibliography.

Tables and Figure.

PATTERNS AND STYLES IN THE SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS IN INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES FOLLOWING CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Arye Perlberg and Esther Theodor

I - INTRODUCTION

It is commonly agreed that teaching does not achieve the overall aim of education, which Gage (1964) defined as the function of inducing learning in the most desirable and effective ways.

Programs of teacher training and of in-service education for teachers are concerned with helping the teacher to improve instruction and to answer Gage's central question, "What should I do in the classroom?" (1968) Yet success is not achieved because of a lack of satisfactory theories of teaching, which should not be confused with theories of learning. (Gage, 1964, 1968).

Our ability to explain and predict in teacher education is limited even more than in teaching. First of all, if we don't know how to teach, we cannot know how to instruct teaching. Secondly, the area of teacher training has been explored much less than teaching itself. Goldhammer (1969) states that supervision has never really been defined as a professional practice. There are no special theories or techniques which a supervisor must master. Most supervisory acts are based on arbitrary evaluations which the supervisor performs in very much the same manner in which he experienced his supervisor's performance a few decades ago.

The study presented here was designed to provide a descriptive basis of one particular and limited supervisory activity and its subsequent impact on teachers. Such a description is a necessary prerequisite for further research in which the variables discovered here would be manipulated in order to study their behavior and influence.

In many cases, supervisory efforts in Israel are directed at schools in culturally-disadvantaged areas. This study focused on a principal mode of supervision in such schools, the individual conference which follows classroom observation.

II - OBJECTIVES

1) Identification of supervisory patterns and styles and their classification into general categories of teaching.

2) Examination of the individual supervisor's style and its variation or consistency across conferences and teachers.

3) Examination of the variation in style and patterns between the supervisors.

4) Identification of supervisory patterns and styles preferred and rejected by teachers and of those supervisory behaviors which are not considered important by teachers.

The study had a fifth objective, which was investigated on an explorative level only, that of learning some aspects of each supervisor's perception of her own conferences and of their impact on the teachers.

III - THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

A. Values and Aims in Supervision

The view of supervision which is briefly outlined here is congruent with the attitudes that are found in modern literature.

Supervision is intended to enhance the learner's self-sufficiency and freedom to act; to change and elasticize his attitudes; and to increase incentives and skills for making, pursuing, examining and evaluating intelligent decisions. Supervision for teachers of culturally-disadvantaged children aims to make the teacher familiar with the special problems of his pupils and with the directions of compensatory or restorative education.

To further such learning, supervision must be a gratifying face to face relationship, supportive, emphatic, non-authoritative and non-punitive, which is based on intellectual honesty, mutual trust and esteem, and open-mindedness and encouragement of self-initiated activity and on the readiness to abstain from dogmatism, conformism, egocentrism and authoritarianism. Such relationships, we believe, are essential for the teacher's own learning and his ability to establish similar relationships in his class.

B. Teaching Supervision and the Rationale for Centering on Patterns in Supervision

Though we are convinced that good teaching involves intuition and art, we believe, as do Gage (1964), Taba (1966), Hunt (1966), Joyce (1967, 1968), Allen (1969), Goldhammer (1969), Minkowitz (1969), Lamm (1969), Flanders (1970), Rubin (1970), Frankenstein (1970) and others, that many elements of

teaching must and can be taught. Since supervision is teaching, this applies to supervision as well, but on another level.

Lamm (1969) rephrases McLuhan's (1964) principle and says "The method is the content of teaching," and emphasizes the importance of teaching the ability to perform. Likewise, Goldhammer (1969) states that "The learner's relationships to the content are mediated by the teacher." The teacher with his biases, his values, his distortions and the like "becomes subtly, inextricably and inevitably insinuated into the curriculum."

Teaching behavior like all human behavior is patterned, which means that certain elements of any teacher's behavior tend to be repetitive, thus having cumulative effects on the pupils' learnings, the intended as well as the incidental. It is this net of salient patterns which must be detected by the supervisor and the teacher, or in the case of teaching supervision, by the supervisor and the one who guides her, in order to enable them to work toward change in the desired direction.

"Many teaching patterns are common rather than idiosyncratic," writes Goldhammer, but "the teacher's unique identity can be defined largely by his peculiar set of patterns."

Here it seems useful to distinguish between three levels of describing, studying and training of teaching or supervisory behavior.

On the first level there are the patterns which are classified into categories. A supervisory pattern is a separate mode of behavior which is repetitious and hypothesized to be significantly related to the learning or changing of the teacher in the context of the supervision.

On the second level there are sets of patterns. A set consists of two patterns or more, which tend to appear in one supervisor's behavior, and regarding which it is hypothesized that the influence of one pattern on the learner is dependent on the influence or meaning of the other patterns.

On the third level there is the supervisory style which is the unique overall set of all salient patterns of the individual supervisor. The style includes all sets, and in its presentation there is an attempt to show the blending of patterns and sets into a characteristic whole.

C. Problems of Individual Conferences Following Classroom Observation

Individual conferences may have different faces. They may contribute to the teacher's professional growth, but, on the other hand, they may be nothing but another distasteful burden. Spears (1953), Barr et al. (1947), Goldhammer (1969), and others give ample examples of poorly performed conferences. Again, one main way to avoid such failure is knowledge of one's behavior.

It appears that knowing the preferences and rejections of teachers is not less important. Spears (1953) suggests measuring the value of supervisory programs by the affection and respect shown for them by the teachers. Kagan et al. (1967) list client cooperation among the four characteristics of client growth. The fruitlessness of a relationship which is meant to be helpful, resulting from the client feeling that he has been attacked or rejected by the helping agent, is emphasized by Lewin (1948) as well as by Allport and Rogers (1961).

IV - METHOD

A. Subjects

1) Supervisors. Five supervisors, members of a group of 45 special guidance supervisors, who function in the four basic grades of elementary schools for culturally-disadvantaged pupils, served as subjects. These special guidance supervisors are relieved of all inspectional-administrative tasks, do not report on the teachers and have no authoritative power. Their aim is to promote teaching in order to repair the children's impaired intelligence. They work closely together with the teachers. One of their main techniques is the use of individual conferences following frequent classroom visits. The subjects of the study had 7 to 10 years experience.

2) Teachers. All 20 teachers had experience of five to 15 years, at least part of which was in schools for culturally-disadvantaged pupils. All had experience with the above mentioned supervisors, but not with the subjects of this study.

B. Procedure

On each of five days, one of five teachers taught a different group of five culturally-disadvantaged fourth graders. Each lesson lasted seven minutes and was focused on a short text, handed out without accompanying instructions to the teacher some days before. The lessons, given in a microteaching laboratory,

were attended and observed by the five supervisors and were video- and audiotaped. Supervisors, teachers and pupils were not acquainted previously. After each lesson, the five supervisors and the teacher concerned observed the V.T.R. and then each supervisor held an independent ten-minute conference with the teacher. These conferences were also video- and audiotaped. Following each conference the respective supervisor and teacher completed a questionnaire which requested an evaluation of the supervisor's behavior and intentions during the conference. At the end of the fifth conference, each teacher was asked which supervisor he would most prefer and which he would most reject, if assigned to him for the next year.

Participants were asked to refrain from discussing the study while it was in progress. The serial variable was controlled by systematical variation of the order in which conferences were held.

After the data were analyzed, 15 other teachers who had neither been guided in this research, nor been present at the conferences and who were unacquainted with the five guided teachers and the supervisors, listened to the taped conferences (audio only). These listening teachers were divided into five groups, and each group of three listened to one series of conferences held on one day by all five supervisors with one guided teacher. Each listening teacher rated the five supervisors independently from most preferred to most rejected, supplying written reasons for his choice.

C. Analysis

The verbal behavior of the supervisors was analyzed by a qualitative method, based on Goldhammer's model[1] and on his rationales. Patterns of supervisory behavior were discovered, labelled and classified into general categories of teaching, which were devised during the course of the analysis. The advantages of this method are that one can find the actual salient behaviors, discover novelties and unearth interesting connections rather than be inhibited by an a priori set of categories which tell one what to look for, but may prevent observation of what is actually happening and what may be the decisive behaviors of the observed. Distortion is a danger

(1) Goldhammer, R. Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

with every method, so that systematic self-examination is needed in any case.

Existing sets of categories do not cover the whole range of behaviors even in the specific domain which each of them claims to investigate. Thus, for example, in Flanders' system there is no category for interruption, for excessive flattery and many other affective behaviors. Therefore, these systems are insufficient for the study of a supervisor's salient patterns and sets and his style.

In the pre-determined systems of analysis the emphasis is on frequency. That frequency is an important factor follows from the definition of a pattern. But frequency must be combined with significance for the learner in order for it to be worth discussing. Degree of extremity and context of occurrence also make a difference. Once again the a priori sets of categories are unsatisfactory and may create a false picture in spite of satisfactory statistical reliability.

Had quantitative methods been used for analyzing the data in our relatively low structured system, we believe that we would have found much lower interobserver correlations than those reported by ready-for-use structured systems. The reasons for this are obvious: the rougher and fewer the categories and the more specified the criteria for classification, the higher the probability for a high correlation. According to Goldhammer's method it is perfectly possible that two observers will conceptualize the same behaviors in different patterns and categories, both being acceptable. Concerning this, Goldhammer comments that "The existence of plural alternatives in clinical supervision may cause happiness or frustration, depending upon one's ability to tolerate conditions of free choice." In spite of the low statistical reliability which we expect, we believe that basically and essentially the descriptions received from two competent observers would be quite similar.

By repeatedly scanning and reading the data intensively, patterns were detected and classified. Occasionally, a pattern was classified into different categories and thus its varied qualities were highlighted. An effort was made not to neglect apparently insignificant, pale episodes and every analysis was checked in various ways to eliminate biases as much as possible. In the end, the patterns and sets of each supervisor were organized into a meaningful whole, namely his style, in which were considered the most frequent and prominent patterns, the influence of one pattern on another, the significance for the teacher's learning, the degree of extremes in the

behavior and the overall "flavor."

V - RESULTS

A. Analysis of the Conferences

Numerous patterns of supervisory behavior were identified, named and classified into 20 general categories of teaching. The categories were: source of initiation; structuring; structure; method; location of intellectual activity and its education; questioning; supervisor as a model for intellectual activity, which included verbal and conceptual clarity, elaboration and consistency regarding the issue under discussion; rationales and evidence; stereotypy; "centeredness;" responsiveness to the teacher; completeness of communication; evaluation; planning; rewards; general atmosphere, which included acceptance, support, patience; consistency in behavior; reference to problems of the culturally-disadvantaged; content; and quantity of talk.

There was a certain degree of overlapping between the categories ("The supervisor announces the theme for discussion" may be classified as "source of initiation" and "structuring"). The patterns in each category did not form a continuum, nor did they encompass all the possibilities in the respective category. The patterns define the category in so far as the behaviors which fit it logically were actually identified. Thus in further conferences new patterns may appear and fit these or other categories. We have mentioned the absence of some patterns which had been expected according to our frame of values and aims in supervision.

Each supervisory style was found to be determined by sets of two or more patterns which tended to appear together and to influence the meaning of each other. The significance of a single pattern varies with the set in which it appears. For example, supervisor E displayed a pattern for interrupting the teacher's talk along with patterns of high responsiveness to the teacher and affective and conceptual acceptance. Supervisor C displayed the same pattern of interrupting together with the patterns of low responsiveness to the teacher, locating the intellectual activity with the supervisor and attributing a passive role to the teacher. Supervisor D, in turn, manifested this same interrupting pattern together with attempts to evade the teacher's opinion which contradicted her own. The messages of the several interruptions may be interpreted quite differently: supervisor E, great eagerness to respond to the teacher; supervisor C, lack of interest in the teacher; supervisor D, defensive in attempting to remain always in the right.

Each style was found to be organized around dominant patterns which form something like a "top-set" and lend the style much of its uniqueness.

A remarkable consistency was found in the patterns, sets and style of each supervisor, independent of conferences and teachers. Two supervisors manifested more than one style (supervisor B: three styles; supervisor D: two styles), but in both cases there remained many patterns and sets common to all conferences held by a supervisor.

In no case was a supervisory style common to two supervisors. Nevertheless, there were more shared patterns than idiosyncratic. This result again supports the notion that the determining factor is the sets, i.e. the combination and blend of the patterns.

No salient supervisory behaviors aimed at developing abilities of self-promotion were detected in any of the conferences.

B. The Teachers' Evaluations

Tables 1, 2 and 3 present the teachers' choices and rankings.

INSERT TABLES 1, 2 AND 3

The correlation[(2)] between the preferences and rejections of the guided teachers and between the ranking of the listening teachers was found to be positive and high, rho = .83. This high correlation proves that teachers' preferences and rejections are not due to specific situational variables of one of the teacher groups, but depend on the stimuli common to both groups, i.e. the supervisor's verbal behavior: what he says and how he says it. Thus the teacher's evaluation does not depend on the supervisor's appearance, on the teacher being the object of the guidance, on being present at the actual occurrence or perceiving it through audio mediation only, on the entire non-verbal behavior nor on the opportunity to spend some time in informal conversation prior to the conference.

The high correlation permits us to consider the two groups of teachers together in the following presentation of their evaluations. The

---

(2) Spearman rank correlation, $\text{rho} = 1 - \frac{6\Sigma d^2}{N^3-N}$

teachers' evaluations were expressed on two levels:

1) Referring to preferred or rejected supervisors, which may be considered as identical with reference to their supervisory styles;

2) Referring to patterns or sets of patterns.

The outstanding preference for supervisor A is clearly seen as are the rejections of supervisors B and C, with B being rejected even more than C. Supervisors D and E are in an intermediate position, that is sometimes accepted and sometimes rejected.

In the search for reasons why contradictions occurred in the evaluations of supervisors D and E, we computed rank correlations (rho), comparing the rankings of every listening teacher with each of the others, in order to find whether distinct groups of teachers exist. In that case, teachers within each group would be related by high correlations, but separated from other groups by low correlations. Such a finding would indicate that some teachers refer to certain aspects of the supervision and ignore others. The correlations ranged from 1.0 to -.9 and, as figure 1 illustrates,no distinct groups were formed among those teachers among whom the correlation was at least +.6. Figure 1 presents the positive correlations between the listening teachers from +.6 and above.

INSERT FIGURE 1

In this figure, a line connecting two names indicates that the correlation between them is .6 or more. The teacher whose name is written in the center circle is connected in this way with six others. Those names which appear in the second circle are connected with five other teachers and so on.

The explanation for the similarities and contradictions in the teachers' evaluations was found in the content of the reasons which the teachers gave for choices.

Different teachers referred to different supervisory behaviors while evaluating the same conference or different conferences by the same supervisor. There was almost complete agreement among the teachers as to which behaviors they liked and which they disliked. Since supervisor A manifested primarily preferred behaviors, almost all teachers ranked her high though for different reasons. Since almost all the behaviors of supervisor B

were disliked, she was mostly ranked low. Both supervisors D and E manifested both positive and negative evaluated behaviors. The different rankings can thus be traced to that behavior, positive or negative, which was perceived as outstanding by each teacher, and not to differences in rating the specific behaviors. We have no clear answer to the question: What is it that caused one teacher to be aware of one behavior and the second of another?

If we divide the supervisory behaviors into two broad domains, the interpersonal and the guiding-instructional, it may be said that all teachers considered the behavior in both domains in determining their choices. The reasons for preference or rejection in all cases combined both domains. In the intermediate rankings, the direction of evaluation sometimes changed from one domain to the other and even within the guiding-instructional domain itself, the same teacher rating the same supervisor partly positively and partly negatively. This means that the teacher retained the ability to differentiate, whereas in the interpersonal domain the halo effect was total, that is all evaluations of one teacher of one supervisor where either plus or minus.

The same supervisory pattern may or may not bring about a preference, depending on the set in which it appears. Patterns which were mentioned as reasons for preference, where found to be repeated as reasons in fourth place rankings. Their positive features were obscured by rejected patterns, with which they formed a set.

The patterns most preferred by the teachers were task orientation and relevance to the lessons, relevant encouragement and positive rewards, talking in a pleasant tone, understanding the teacher, allowing the teacher to express herself, clarity, simplicity, and polite criticism accompanied by practical advice. The most rejected patterns were sharp or exclusive criticism, aggressiveness, "cross-examination," lack of positive rewards, imposing of opinions and knowing everything better than the teacher, not permitting the teacher to talk, rejection of teacher's action and speech, lengthy monologues, dwelling on general or marginal issues, confusion and lack of practical advice.

The teachers did not complain about the salient authoritative and egocentric patterns which supervisors manifested. On the contrary, they expected the supervisor to know what was right and what was wrong, and to tell them what to do and how to do it. All they requested was

that it be done in a kind and pleasant manner, without being imposed upon and with provision made for them to express themselves. Letting the teacher express herself was valued per se and not as a means for enhancing the teacher's independence. No teacher complained about the obvious absence of encouraging intellectual autonomy, independent inquiry, analysis, planning and self-evaluation. One-sided initiative by the supervisor did not disturb them. Pleasant authoritarianism was more than satisfactory, it was wished for!

Also, the teachers were not troubled by the level of the supervisors intellectual activity. They valued lesson orientedness, simplicity and clarity, but they did not comment on superficiality or lack of rationales whenever they occurred. Obviously, they did not differentiate, even roughly, between high or low order questions or elaborations.

The qualities of supervision which the teachers listed as reasons for their choices validated our analysis of the conferences in one direction. Nearly all behaviors and their combinations which the teachers noticed were identified in our analysis. But the teachers did not detect all patterns and sets which we unearthed, nor did they draw a full integrative picture of every supervisor's style. Nevertheless, the evaluations by all teachers combined clearly establish the distinct characteristic style of each supervisor, congruent with those styles which we have consolidated in our analysis, though less complete. The following is a description of four styles which were drawn from evaluations presented repeatedly by several teachers.

Supervisor A (the most preferred). She speaks in a pleasant tone, encourages the teacher, refers to the essentials of the lesson and explains her opinions orderly and clearly. She starts from the positive features and builds on them. She does not ignore the negative aspects of the lessons, but she expresses her criticism in a kind manner, so that is is easy to accept. She makes suggestions and gives practical advice without trying to impose her opinion. She allows the teacher to express herself and understands her.

Supervisor B (the most rejected). She speaks, comments and questions in an unpleasant, aggressive and embarrassing manner. She constantly disagrees and criticizes, thereby forcing the teacher into a defensive position, without offering any solutions. She deals with marginal issues, is not ready to accept other opinions and does not relate

to the teacher's comments. Her own behavior is inconsistent with her demands from the teacher.

Supervisor C. She "plays it from rank" and is very fond of her own ideas which she expresses in lengthy monologues, filled with unfamiliar professional terms. She talks about important things, but very generally, in the abstract, without relating to the specific lessons. She is not consistent in her topics, jumps from one issue to another, is not interested in the teacher's opinion and thus increases confusion. Yet, she is never aggressive, expresses her criticism tenderly and sometimes is even pleasant.

Supervisor E. On one hand she is very pleasant, gives positive rewards to the teacher, relieves the teacher's anxieties, relates to her personally, encourages her to talk, and values and accepts the teacher's opinion even if it contradicts her own. She refers to important matters. On the other hand, she uses excessive flattery and does not criticize even if it it is called for. Therefore, she is considered unpleasant and ineffective. She induces confusion with her conceptual and semantic disorder and lack of clarity. It is impossible to understand what she is after, though she tries to elicit from the teacher exactly what she wants to hear.

C. Some Aspects of the Supervisors' Perceptions of Their Own Supervision

In this, the exploratory part of the study, it was found that the supervisors generally did not define explicit/ operational objectives in terms of terminal behavior, neither for themselves nor for the teachers. The supervisors confused the problems in hand and their objectives. The teachers perceived the supervisor's objectives partially and unclearly, or not at all.

The supervisors tended to evaluate their own conferences more positively than negatively and inclined towards exaggerating their virtues. During the conferences, in order to evaluate whether they had achieved their goal, they did not use any techniques other than the question "do you understand?". Following the conference, their criteria for this evaluation were mainly impressionistic and part egocentric ("The teacher cooperated with me").

Each supervisor listed positive points in each of her five conferences, but found weaknesses and limitations in only three. The weaknesses mentioned by the supervisors were usually less essential than

the strengths. Sometimes the failings were projected on the teacher[3] and the strengths were quite egocentric[4], though some were centered on the teacher. Most suggestions for changes, if the supervisor was to repeat the same conference, related to non-central techniques. Some suggestions referred to the inter-personal domain. The opinions which the supervisors attributed to the teachers, concerning what contribution the conferences would have on their future teaching and their feelings after the conferences, were to a fair extent illusory.

VI - DISCUSSION

A. The Advantages of the Unstructured A Postriori Categorization

The multiplicity of actual patterns significant for supervision, which were identified and classified into fitting categories, could never have been detected had we been restricted by the demand to search for predetermined behaviors and to mark tallies in cells or columns whenever these behaviors occurred. By perceiving the patterns as set-dependent, we were able not only to detect each supervisor's central patterns, but to present them as a meaningful whole. This could be accomplished by considering frequency, extremity, change of meaning according to the categories into which they are classified and mainly according to their combinations into sets, and their relation to other patterns.

B. Consistency and Change in Supervisory Behavior

The results support Allport's (1937) and Goldhammer's theory that the individual's style is unique and enduring. The repetition of patterns and sets, regardless of the change in teachers and lessons, supports Allport's idea that the individual creates situations to exercise his traits. The implication is clear: more than adapting herself to the teacher, the supervisor tried to mold the teacher to fit her own style. The guided teachers were quite quick in learning the intellectual and interpersonal roles they were allocated by each supervisor: how best to fit the supervisor's patterns, whether to be active or passive and whether to be defensive or not. Thus, it is clear that the supervisors did not apply flexible differential guidance (in the sense of Joyce), although the supervisors' ability to consider individual differences

---

(3) "I can't talk to somebody who keeps interrupting me" - supervisor D after a conference in which she had interrupted the teacher more ofter than vice versa.

(4) "I gave her points to think about."

was somewhat restricted since they were not acquainted with the teachers beforehand. This study showed that training is needed in the proficiency to answer individual needs.

In spite of the uniqueness of styles, the many common patterns may be helpful in finding the balance between group guidance and individual guidance for the supervisors.

C. The Set as the Unit of Guidance

Since the meaning and impact of a pattern are set-dependent, we suggest organizing the guidance for supervisors around sets of two patterns or more, learning their interaction and controlling the degree of complexity which the supervisor understands and is able to control. In addition, by pointing out the relations between patterns, better transfer of learning will be achieved. Thus neither in research nor in guidance will the unit of treatment be the whole teaching (which fits Gage's conception)- but it will not be the single pattern either. Thus we will not repeat Gage's error in first dealing with separate bits and neglecting the decisive factor, namely, the interrelations. By doing so, we will avoid the embarrassment that things do not fit well together to form the desired synthesis. It is not news that the whole is more than a simple sum of its parts. We would never have understood the qualities of water had we investigated oxygen and hydrogen separately. We learned about oxygen, its traits and behavior, only by combining it with hydrogen, with iron and with a neutral element.

It is easy to imagine alternative ways of starting with simple narrow sets and slowly widening them. One may identify the most salient patterns of a supervisor and then build up a central positive pattern (what might possibly fit to it?)or attempt to build sets meant to achieve a specific supervisory goal (i.e. strengthening the teacher's sense of security - what patterns in the categories of acceptance, rewards, questioning, planning, etc. would be suitable) and so on.

Frequently, the teachers reasons were given in terms of sets, indicating the interaction between patterns. These sets too might serve as a starting point for supervision.

D. Checking the Patterns Against Values and Aims in Supervision

Amongst the patterns which do not fit our frame of values and aims, the most conspicuous and harmful is the grouping which consists of

patterns restraining the development of the teacher's professional self-promotion. The supervisor is the unquestioned source of initiation, knowledge, advice, evaluation, etc. The supervisor does not even bother to inform the teacher on procedure, for it is assumed that the supervisor's plan of action is correct. A teacher whose intellectual autonomy, rational thinking, readiness to dare to experiment, and ability to accept responsibility for his learning and doing are weakened by the guidance he receives, will hardly be the person to develop such elements in his class.

None of the identified styles embodied this grouping exactly and in toto, but to some extent it was present in all of them.

Within the limits of this paper it is impossible to elaborate on the conclusions drawn from the diversity of patterns identified. We will limit ourselves to mentioning that some behaviors may be more easily changed through learning techniques while others, which are anchored in deep lying personality dispositions, may be treated through sensitivity groups. Some behaviors can not be altered significantly in adult supervisors since they are dependent on intelligence variables.

E. Pleasantness and Efficiency

The question is what value can be assigned to the feedback received by teachers after guiding conferences. There is no doubt that knowing the teacher's overt and covert responses, his thoughts and feelings, improves the supervisor's ability to establish real communication and to interpret the teacher's ability in a more accurate way. As Kagan et al (1967) state, the client's own statement of his feelings has greater credibility than the hypothesized statement from a third person. Though we agree that rejected supervisory patterns or styles are apt to impede the expected progress, we disagree with Spears' equating affection and respect expressed by the teachers with the efficiency of the supervision given.

The teachers were quite content with kindly exercised authoritative patterns and with the lack of opportunity for growth in self-promotion. An opportunity to experience freedom, responsibility and independence might have frightened them and they might have tried to escape from it into convenient, well-known, alienating, illusory security (Fromm,1941).

Satisfaction with the present owing to ignorance of the unknown and a fear of change, does not mean that the present is really good. According to our values, new motivations must be aroused in the teachers. Their complacency must be shaken and they must be prompted to experience self-expansion and creativity. In the beginning teachers may be hesitant or unwilling, but some types of conflict and tension are fruitful (Getzels, 1963). It is the obligation of supervisors to inspire teachers and not to illude themselves that mere pleasantness equals efficiency.

F. Styles of Evaluation

If we had found among the teachers groups consisting of teachers whose opinions correlate with one another, while having a negative correlation with those of the teachers of the other groups, we would have been able to "predict a postriori" (or to explain) how each group would evaluate each style (after our analysis). It may be that the relative homogenity of the teacher's professional background is the reason for the absence of such grouping.

G. Implications for the Importance of Verbal Behavior

From the high correlation found between the choices of the two groups of teachers, both guided and listening, who were exposed to different situational stimuli, we concluded that the factor determining choice is the one stimulus common to both groups, namely the supervisors' verbal behaviors. A practical implication is that this permits us to make use of outside teachers' evaluations in guiding supervisors, which has the advantage of avoidance of the generosity error and,furthermore, that data may be collected and used independently of time and place.

In analysing the conferences, we realized that there were no differences whether the V.T.R. or T.R. was used. This discovery is of practical value for T.Rs. are cheaper and easier to operate and to transport than V.T.Rs., so that this type of work need not be confined to only a few institutions.

H. Some Aspects of the Supervisors' Perceptions of the Supervision

Teaching the supervisors to define supervisory operational objectives may improve the structuring and the structure of the conference,

aid the teacher in understanding the direction of the supervision, and thus permit better communication between supervisor and teacher. It may help the supervisor to discriminate between flexible change and blind confusion, in which both partners have but a tenuous concept of what is going on, and it may aid the supervisor to exercise evaluative techniques.

One by-product of the study was found to be quite significant for validating Allport's (1937) and Goldhammer's theories, on which we based our examination of enduring patterns and styles. We found a conspicuous consistency and continuity between the supervisory style of each supervisor and between her self-evaluation and her perception of the teacher's opinions and feelings. Thus we are tempted to conceive all these behaviors as consistent segments of a wide and inclusive life-style, segments which can be joined together and which in all probability fit with other segments from different areas in the person's life. According to this notion, it may be possible to predict from knowing one or two of the three - the supervisory style of a supervisor, her evaluation of her own strengths and weaknesses, or the opinions and feelings which she attributes to the teacher - at least some features of the other.

V - CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates how the use of microteaching techniques enables us to collect a wealth of comparable data about supervisory behavior in a relative short time and under well controlled conditions. This technique combined with qualitative analysis of the data, investigating the individual's dominant and persuasive patterns of behavior which determine his general style (without a priori categories), ensures highly relevant and accurate information, useful for research on supervision and in training supervisors.

During the reporting of this research many possibilities for further research arose. These are presented in our complete report. In this paper we shall confine ourselves to mentioning a few of those suggestions.

- Blind classification of the 25 conferences into style-groups by competent judges.
- Analysis of the same 25 conferences, using ready-made category systems.
  1) Attempt to match each two analyses referring to the same conference.
  2) Attempt to outline the supervisors' styles by the use of the systematic analyses only.

- The relation between preference and efficiency, where efficiency is defined in terms of amount and direction of change.
- A long term comparison between the results of authoritarian supervision and supervision which is oriented towards prompting the teacher's self-promotion.
- The relation between the same teacher's behavior in conferences with supervisors of different styles, and the relation between the same supervisor's behavior in conferences with teachers of heterogeneous background.
- Comparison between the supervisor's degree of empathy towards a teacher guided by him and towards teachers guided by other supervisors (influence of defenses).
- Comparison between the supervisor's competence in analyzing his own conference and that of his colleague.
- Comparison between different methods of guiding supervisors, the unit of guidance being:
    1) One pattern or skill at a time;
    2) One set of patterns at a time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, D.W. & Ryan, K.A. Microteaching. Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley, 1969.
2. Allport, G.W. Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1937.
3. Allport, G.W. Cited in "Conduct, Knowledge and Acceptance of New Values" by K. Lewin in Resolving Social Conflicts, New York, Harper Bros., 1948.
4. Barr, A.S., Burton, W.A. & Brueckner, L.J. Supervision. 2nd edition. New York, D. Appleton Century, 1947.
5. Flanders, Ned. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley, 1970.
6. Frankenstein, C. Impaired Intelligence. Jerusalem, School of Education, Hebrew University, and the Ministry of Education and Culture, 1970.
7. Fromm, E. Escape from Freedom. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941.
8. Gage, N.L. "Theories of Teaching." The 3rd Yearbook of the N.S.S.E., Chicago, 1964.
9. Gage, N.L. "An Analytical Approach to Research on Instructional Methods." Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, June, 1968.
10. Getzels, J.W. "Conflict and Role Behavior in the Educational Setting." Readings in the Social Psychology of Education. W.W. Charters and N.L. Gage (Editors). Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1963.
11. Goldhammer, R. Clinical Supervision, Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
12. Hunt, D.E. "A Model for Analyzing the Training of Training Agents." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, Vol. 12, No. 2, 1966.
13. Joyce, B.R. & Harootunian, B. The Structure of Teaching. Chicago, Science Research Associates, Inc., 1967.
14. Joyce, B.R. The Teacher Innovator: A Program to Prepare Teachers. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968.
15. Kagan, N. et al. Studies in Human Interaction. Interpersonal Process Recall Stimulated by Videotape. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1967.

16. Lamm, Z. "Teaching to Teachers, Didactic Principles in Teacher Training Institutions." Yearbook of Teacher Training Institutions. Jerusalem, The Department of Teacher Training, the Ministry of Education, 1969. (In Hebrew).

17. Lewin, K. "Conduct, Knowledge and Acceptance of New Values." Resolving Social Conflicts. New York, Harper Bros., 1948.

18. Minkowitz, A. "Curriculum, Structure of the School and Teaching Methods." HaChinuch, No. 2, Israel Teachers' Association, December, 1969. (In Hebrew).

19. Rogers, C. On Becoming A Person. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

20. Spears, H. Improving the Supervision of Instruction. Englewood Cliffs,N.J., Prentice-Hall, Sixth Printing, 1953.

21. Taba, H. Teaching Strategies and Cognitive Functioning in Elementary School Children. Cooperative Research Project No. 2404, San Francisco State College, February, 1966.

TABLE 1

The Guided Teachers' Choices (N=5)

Graded Teachers \ Supervisors	A	B	C	D	E
R	+	-			
T	+	-			
N				+	-
L	+	-			
F	+		-		
Total +	4	0	0	1	0
TOTAL -	0	3	1	0	1

+ stands for preference .

- stands for rejection.

TABLE 2

The Listening Teachers' Rankings (N = 15)

Supervisors / Rankings of Listening Teachers	A	B	C	D	E
Preferences	10	0	0	2	3
Second Choice	3	1	4	4	3
Third Choice	0	5	5	1	4
Fourth Choice	2	6	1	5	1
Rejection	0	3	5	3	4

TABLE 3

Preferences and Rejections of all Teachers (N = 20)

Supervisors / Choices	A	B	C	D	E
Preferences	14	0	0	3	3
Rejections	0	6	6	3	5